

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-27 stand rejected. Herein, no Claim has been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-27 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. Herein, the Specification has been amended to correct the informalities. No new matter was added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 are objected to because of misnumbering. Since Claim 3 is dependent on Claim 1, not Claim 2, use of "f)" is proper. Since Claim 4 is dependent on Claim 1, not Claim 3, use of "f)" is proper. Since Claim 10 is dependent on Claim 8, not Claim 9, use of "f)" is proper. Since Claim 11 is dependent on Claim 8, not Claim 10, use of "f)" is proper. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jain et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,606,596 (hereafter Jain). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

A method of establishing one of a plurality of network links ***on a computer system***, comprising the steps of:

- a) ***associating one or more alternative network link designations*** with one or more of said network links;
- b) requesting a first network link of said plurality of network links;
- c) ***initiating said first network link***;
- d) determining whether a particular alternative network link designation is associated with said first network link; and
- e) ***if said step c) fails to establish said first network link and if said particular alternative network link designation is associated with said first network link***, initiating a particular network link of said plurality of network links based on said particular alternative network link designation. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Jain does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, the Office action (at page 3) cites several portions of Jain to support the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). On the contrary, Jain is directed to a method unlike the method recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Jain discloses a method for locating nomadic users in a personal communication services (PSC) system/network. [Jain; Abstract; Figures 2B, 3B, and 5B]. More particularly, Jain is directed to

operations performed by a network to locate a user/device instead of directed to operations performed by a device desiring to connect/establish link with a network, as disclosed in Independent Claim 1. In Jain, the network needs to locate the PCS user/device to direct a call made to the PCS user/device. [Jain; Abstract; Figures 2B, 3B, and 5B]. However, Jain fails to disclose operations performed by the PCS user/device to initiate a network link with the network and to respond to the failure of establishing the network link with the network. Also, Jain fails to disclose associating alternative network link designations with the network links. Jain does not disclose that if the network link cannot be established, the PCS device attempts to establish an alternative network link based on the alternative network link designation rather than simply providing to the PSC user an error message. This functionality would improve the user experience and reduce interruptions that annoy and frustrate the user.

Unlike Jain, Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of establishing one of a plurality of network links on a computer system. The method includes a) associating one or more alternative network link designations with one or more of said network links and b) requesting a first network link of said plurality of network links. Further, the method includes c) initiating said first network link and d) determining whether a particular alternative network link designation is associated with said first network link. Also, the method includes e) if said step c) fails to establish said first network link and if said particular alternative network

link designation is associated with said first network link, initiating a particular network link of said plurality of network links based on said particular alternative network link designation. As described above, Jain does not disclose the cited claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Jain and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-7 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Jain. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-7 are patentable over Jain for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 8 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 8 is directed a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions stored therein for performing a method of establishing one of a plurality of network links on a computer system. The method includes a) associating one or more alternative network link designations with one or more of said network links and b) requesting a first network link of said plurality of network links. Further, the method includes c) initiating said first network link and d) determining whether a particular alternative network link designation is associated with said first network link. Also, the

method includes e) if said step c) fails to establish said first network link and if said particular alternative network link designation is associated with said first network link, initiating a particular network link of said plurality of network links based on said particular alternative network link designation. Therefore, Independent Claim 8 is allowable over Jain for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 9-14 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 8, which is allowable over Jain. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9-14 are patentable over Jain for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 15 recites a computer system comprising a memory device having computer-executable instructions stored therein for performing a method of establishing one of a plurality of network links on a computer system. The method includes a) associating one or more alternative network link designations with one or more of said network links and b) requesting a first network link of said plurality of network links. Further, the method includes c) initiating said first network link and d) determining whether a particular alternative network link designation is associated with said first network

link. Also, the method includes e) if said step c) fails to establish said first network link and if said particular alternative network link designation is associated with said first network link, initiating a particular network link of said plurality of network links based on said particular alternative network link designation. Therefore, Independent Claim 15 is allowable over Jain for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 16-21 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 15, which is allowable over Jain. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 16-21 are patentable over Jain for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 22 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 22 recites a computer system comprising a processor, wherein a first network link of a plurality of network links is initiated in response to a request for said first network link, and wherein if said first network link is not established and if a user has previously designated an alternative network link for said first network link, said alternative network link is initiated. Therefore, Independent Claim 22 is allowable over Jain for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 23-27 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 22, which is allowable over Jain. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 23-27 are patentable over Jain for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above arguments and remarks overcome all rejections. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-27) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: _____

11/9/2004

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060